



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/514,149	02/28/2000	Siroos K. Afshar	IDS-1999-0710	9235

7590 01/29/2003

S H Dworetsky
AT&T Corporation
P O Box 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/514,149

Applicant(s)

AFSHAR ET AL.

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ablay et al (US Patent 6,002, 941) in view of Elie Najm et al (From SIB to distributed Objects: A Transformation Approach for Service Creation).

As to claim 1, Ablay teaches graphical blocks (service building blocks, col 2, ln 57-67/ col 7, ln 29-64/ col 5, ln 38-67), service logic script (the logic program rules, col 2, ln 57-67/ col 7, ln 29-64/ col 5, ln 38-67), a service execution environment (service execution environment, col 2, ln 57-67/ col 7, ln 29-64/ col 5, ln 38-67/ col 9, ln 5-10), Ablay teaches manipulate graphically-represented service blocks and installing the logic program rule (col 5, ln 38-65) but Ablay does not explicitly teach manipulate as translate graphical language blocks into programming language environment. However, Najm teaches translate into a java like language (page 1).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Najm to Ablay in order to create the service as efficiently as possible and apply correctness-preserving transformation of service creation.

As to claim 4, Ablay teaches dependencies (authorizes, col 8, ln 61-67), the graphical object (service creation, col 8, ln 61-67), event notifications (notifies/ request,

col 8 ln 61-67 to col 9, ln 1-4), service execution environment (service execution environment, col 8, ln 61-67 to col 9, ln 1-4).

As to claim 5, Albay next state (nest state, col 7, ln 45-55), its completion (a particulate point, col 45-55).

As to claim 7, Albay teaches determine a service (test the new service, col 1 ln 40-45), data (voice/ data communication, col 45-50).

As to claim 9, Albay teaches service-provisioning forms (a data base, col 5, ln 50-60), the entry (information, col 5, ln 50-60).

As to claim 15, Albay does not teach hidden from a user. However, Jallema teaches hidden from the service designer (col 15, ln 18-20).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Jallema to Ablay in order to create the service as efficiently as possible and to receive information and to distribute that information to the destination.

2. Claims 2, 3,6, 8,10, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ablay et al (US Patent 6,002, 941) in view of Elie Najm et al (From SIB to distributed Objects: A Transformation Approach foe Service Creation) and further in view of Jellema et al (US 6,351,646 B1).

As to claim 2, Albay does not explicit teach a service subscriber, required data. However, Jallema teaches subscriber 10, information (col 2, ln 30-40/ col 14, ln 39-48).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Najm to Ablay in order to create the service as efficiently as possible and to receive information and to distribute that information to the destination.

As to claim 3, Albay teaches the graphical objects are map into Service Execution Environment (an identification of a service execution environment matches the identification of authorized service environment, col 16, ln 20-30), Service control and call control functions of the Application Programming Interface (client/ server 409, col 6, ln 1-20), Service Execution Environment (the service execution portion, col 6, ln 1-20).

Albay does not explicit teach service control a call control function of the graphical objects. However, Jallema teaches service control function (col 9, ln 1-8).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Jallema to Ablay in order to create the service as efficiently as possible and to receive information and to distribute that information to the destination.

As to claim 6, Albay teaches application program interfaces (API, col 4, ln 1-12), network (network, col 4, ln 1-12).

As to claim 8, Albay does not explicit teach system data, service data, subscriber data, local data. However, Jallema teaches subscriber, the service data (col 7,ln 25-40).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Jallema to Ablay in order to create the service as efficiently as possible and to receive information and to distribute that information to the destination.

As to claim 10, Albay does not teach subscriber-tuning forms, a service subscriber. However, Jallema teaches the SCF, the subscriber 10 (col 2, ln 39-43).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Jallema to Ablay in order to create the service as efficiently as possible and to receive information and to distribute that information to the destination.

As to claim 11, Albay does not explicit teach service control and call control function for graphical language blocks. However, Jallema teaches service control function (col 9, ln 1-8).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Jallema to Ablay in order to create the service as efficiently as possible and to receive information and to distribute that information to the destination.

As to claim 12, Albay teaches block (service building blocks, col 7, ln 28-40), one input or out put (inputs and outputs, col 7, ln 28-40/ col 9, ln 38-45), a token (the current API Message, col 9, ln 38-45/ col 12, ln 60-67).

As to claim 13, Albay teaches blocks (block 608, col 10, ln 59-67), execution (activate, col 10, ln 59-67), token (message, col 10, ln 59-67).

As to claim 14, Albay teaches plurality of blocks (block 265, block 266, col 15, ln 5-15), execute simultaneously (signaled virtually at the same time, col 15, ln 5-15).

3. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ablay et al (US Patent 6,002, 941) in view of Sun Microsystem(SM) (Objectives and scope).

As to claim 16, Albay teaches a service creation environment (a service creation environment, col 2, ln 56-67), a service logic scrip (logic program rule, col 2, ln 56-67), a service execution environment (service execution environment, col 2, ln 56-67/ col 3, ln 13-19).

Albay does not teach application programming interface. However, SM teaches API/ standard interface (page 1).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Jallema to Ablay in order to provide a flexible interface that supply the functionality necessary to multimedia service.

4. Claims 17, 18-22, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ablay et al (US Patent 6,002, 941) in view of Sun Microsystem(SM) (Objectives and scope) and further in view of Elie Najm et al (From SIB to distributed Objects: A Transformation Approach for Service Creation).

As to claim 17, Albay teaches an editor (editable, col 5, ln 51-65), a data repository (a data base, col 5, ln 51-65), service logic script (logic program rules, col 5, ln 51-65/ graphically represented service building block, col 5, ln 38-65), language logic script (service building block, col 5, ln 38-65).

Albay does teach a translator. However, Najm teach a system for automatically translated into a java like language (page 1).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Najm to Ablay in order to create the service as efficiently as possible and apply correctness-preserving transformation of service creation.

As to claim 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, Albay teaches a service locator (client / server 409, col 6, ln 10-20), a service ID/ service subscriber identification (identification of at least one authorized service execution environment, col 8, ln 43-52), a service logic execution environment (service execution environment, col 8, ln 43-67), logic (the logic program rules, col 8, ln 43-67), service logic executor (service execution environment, col 8, ln 43-67/ col 9, ln 1-10), store (installed, col 9, ln 1-10), inter process communication (CDI 407, col 6, ln 10-39).

Ablay does not a service instantiator, subscriber data. However, Najm teaches service logic, service logic instance, subscriber number, service logic entities, message (col 12, ln 48-67 to col 13, ln 40-49).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Najm to Ablay in order to create the service as efficiently as possible and apply correctness-preserving transformation of service creation.

As to claim 28, Albay teaches a restricted calling service (new telephone based service, col 1, ln 57-64).

5. Claims 23-26, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ablay et al (US Patent 6,002, 941) in view of Sun Microsystem(SM) (Objectives and scope) in view of Elie Najm et al (From SIB to distributed Objects: A Transformation Approach for Service Creation) further in view of Hartikainen et al (US Patent 6,003, 031) and further in view of Jellema et al (US 6,351,646 B1)

As to the rejection of claim 23, see the rejection of claim 11.

As to the rejection of claim 24, see the rejection of claim 12.

As to the rejection of claim 25, see the rejection of claim 13.

As to the rejection of claim 26, see the rejection of claim 14.

As to the rejection of claim 29, see the rejection of claim 15.

5. Claims 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ablay et al (US Patent 6,002, 941) in view of Sun Microsystem(SM) (Objectives and scope) further in view of Elie Najm et al (From SIB to distributed Objects: A Transformation Approach for Service Creation) and further in view of Hartikainen et al (US Patent 6,003, 031).

As to claim 27, Albay does not teach a call follow-me service. However, Hartikainen teaches a flow-me service (col 6, ln 32-40).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Najm to Ablay in order to made multimedia service creation methodology available to various users.


6. Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

Fax phone: AFTER_FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to: (703) 746-2738, OFFICAL faxes must be signed and send to: (703) 746-7239, NON OFFICIAL faxes should not be signed, please send to: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 9000.

LeChi Truong
January 13, 2003



ALVIN OBERLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100